the Members will get it on the 19th and they have to send motions with 6 days' notice. That will be on the 28th since Sundays and the date of receipt are not counted. Therefore we have hardly time to give notice of motions on these.

President.—You can give short notice motions. This is not the opportunity to discuss that. This was rejected by the President being late. You cannot speak about it on the floor of this House.

Mr. K. T. Mathew.—I bring this because it is a matter which affects all the Members of this House. I have got a precedent.

President.—I have given a ruling that it could not be accepted being late. You are at liberty to bring it to my notice. I will then carefully look into that.

Demand put and carried.

Cochin Income-tax Bill.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon.—I beg to present the report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the Cochin Income-tax Bill and move that the Bill as amended by the Committee be taken into consideration by this House.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—I second it.

Motion put and carried.

President.—You may take it that all the clauses and sections to which there are no amendments have been read by me.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—In the light of the amendments that course may not be possible. After considering the amendments the remaining portion may be taken as read.

President.—Yes.

Mr. A. Sankara Menon.—The amendment I propose to move is this: *In the Regulation for the words "the Cochin State" wherever they occur the word "Cochin" may be substituted.* It is only a verbal change. This will bring this Regulation into line with all the previous Regulations. In the previous Regulations there is simply the word Cochin.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—I second it.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon.—I accept it.

Amendment put and carried.

Mr. P. Raman Menon.—I don't move the next amendment.

Hence the following amendment was considered withdrawn.

Mr. P. Raman Menon.—*In Section 1 clause 3 substitute "from the first day of Chingam 1110 M. E." for "at once".*

Question put :—*That the section as amended stands part of the Bill.*

(1) This Report may be called the Cochin Income-tax Report of 1108
(2) It extends to the whole of Cochin : and
(3) It shall come into force at once.

Section carried.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—I beg to move this amendment. In *Section 2 clause 2 "assessee, means a person by whom income-tax is payable as also his legal representative"*. The necessity for the amendment arises from the fact that according to a recent ruling of the Bombay High Court as published in A. I. R. 1931, Bombay 333, assessee refers to a living person and assessment cannot be made on his death on failure to make a return. So that it is only fair that if he happens to die, his legal representative should be made liable to pay the amount in order that the full effect of this enactment might be given effect to. The definition of assessee might be so amended. I believe the House understands me. Assessee means a living person and the assessment cannot be levied on his death if before his death he has not made a return. The amount assessed cannot be realised for the year.

Mr. P. Krishna Menon.—Is this the amendment proposed? What is the amendment to sectian 2, clause 2 ?

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—That is the definition of 'assessee'. Add those words to the definition. I propose that this clause may be amended and the words "as also his legal representative" may be added. That is the amendment.

Mr. P. Krishna Menon.—I beg to second it.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon.—I accept it.

Amendment put and carried.

Question put :—*That section 2 as amended stands part of the Bill.*

2. In this Regulation, unless there is anything repugnant in the subject or context,—

Definitions. (1) 'Agricultural income' means

(a) any rent or revenue derived from land which is used for agricultural purposes, and is either assessed to land revenue on Cochin or subject to a local rate assessed and collected by officers of Government as such ;

(b) any income derived from such land by—

(i) agriculture, or

(ii) the performance by a cultivator or receiver of rent-in-kind of any process ordinarily employed by a cultivator or receiver of rent-in-kind to render the produce raised or received by him fit to be taken to market, or

(iii) the sale by a cultivator or receiver of rent-in-kind of the produce raised or received by him in respect of which no process has been performed other than a process of the nature described in sub-clause (ii), or

(c) any income derived from any building owned and occupied by the receiver of the rent or revenue of any such land, or occupied by the cultivator, or the receiver of the rent-in-kind, of any land with respect to which or the produce of which any operation mentioned in sub-clauses (ii) and (iii) of clause (b) is carried on :

Provided that the building is on or in the immediate vicinity of the land, and is a building which the receiver of the rent or revenue, or the cultivator or the receiver of the rent-in-kind, by reason of his connection with the land, requires as a dwelling house, or as a store-house or other out-building ;

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(2) "Assessee" means a person by whom income-tax is payable, as also his legal representative.

(3) "Business" includes any trade, commerce or manufacture or any adventure or concern in the nature of trade, commerce or manufacture;

(4) "Commissioner" means a person appointed to be Commissioner of Income-tax under section 5 ;

(5) "Company" means a company as defined in the Indian Companies Act, 1913, as made applicable to Cochin by His Highness the Maharaja's Proclamation dated 19th Thulam 1097, and includes any foreign association carrying on business in Cochin whether incorporated or not and whether its principal place of business is situate in Cochin or not, which the Government may, by general or special order, declare to be a company for the purposes of this Regulation ;

(6) "Deputy Commissioner" means a person appointed to be Deputy Commissioner of Income-tax under section (5) :

(7) "Income-tax Officer" means a person appointed to be an Income-tax Officer under section (5) ;

(8) "Local Authority" means any authority legally entitled to or entrusted by Government with the control or management of a Municipal Fund ;

(9) "Magistrate" means a Magistrate of the First Class or a Magistrate of the Second Class specially empowered by the Government to try offences against this Regulation ;

(10) "Person" includes a Hindu undivided family and an undivided Marumakkathayam Tarawad ;

(11) "Prescribed" means prescribed by rules made under this Regulation;

(12) "Previous year" means

(a) the 12 months ending on the last day of Karkadagam next preceding the year for which the assessment is to be made or, if the accounts of the assessee have been made up to a date within the said 12 months in respect of a year ending on any date other than the last day of Karkadagam then at the option of the assessee the year ending on the day to which his accounts have so been made up;

Provided that, if this option has once been exercised by the assessee, it shall not again be exercised so as to vary the meaning of the expression 'Previous year' as then applicable to such assessee, except with the consent of the Income-tax Officer and upon such conditions as he may think fit ; or

(b) in the case of any person, business or company or class of person, business or company, such period as may be determined by the Government or by such authority as the Government may authorise in this behalf;

(13) "Principal Officer" used with reference to a local authority or a company, or association means;—

(a) the Secretary, Treasurer, Manager, or Agent of the authority company, body or association ; or

(b) any person connected with the authority, company, body or association upon whom the Income-tax Officer has served a notice of his intention of treating him as the principal officer thereof ;

(14) "Public Servant" has the same meaning as in the Cochin Penal Code ;

(15) "Registered Firm" means a firm constituted under an instrument of partnership, specifying the individual shares of the partners of which the prescribed particulars have been registered with the income-tax Officer in the prescribed manner ; and

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(16) "Total income" means total amount of income, profits and gains from all sources to which this Regulation applies computed in the manner laid down in section (16); and

(17) "Unregistered firm" means a firm which is not a registered firm.

Section carried.

Mr. A. Sankara Menon.—Sir, I beg to move that *in section 3 of the Bill the figure 1108 be changed into 1109.* This is a substantial amendment which I propose to move. Now the section as it stands taxes the income of 1107. If this Bill is passed as it is, every assessee will have to pay a tax on the income he earned in 1107 and not on the income that he earns in 1108. I shall make my meaning clear by an example. Suppose a person earned ten-thousand rupees in 1107. But he did not earn anything in 1108. Even then he will have to pay a tax on the ten-thousand rupees he earned as profit in 1107. But he may not have to pay any tax in 1109 on the income of 1108 because he did not earn anything in 1108 But we are not concerned with the income of 1108. No notice was given to anybody that the income of 1107 will be taxed in the year 1108. Therefore I say that this Bill should not be made retrospective by enacting that the income of 1107 should be taxed. Suppose a Firm came into existence in 1107 and came to an end at the end of that year. Even though the Firm did not exist in 1108 that Firm will have to pay a tax in 1108. Suppose that Firm was not carrying on any business even then it will have to pay a tax in 1108. It was carrying on business in 1107. It will have to pay a tax in 1108 even though it has become insolvent and the Firm has been dragged into liquidation. On these grounds I say that this provision should be changed and the Bill should not be made retrospective in effect. The principal ground is this, that a proposal to introduce the Income-tax Bill was brought to the notice of the people only in the latter part of the year 1107. Therefore it is not just that the income of 1107 should be taxed. I shall make the point clearer. The Bill is not to the effect that the income of 1108 will be taxed on the basis of the income of 1107 but that even the income of 1107 will be taxed. It is now intended to tax the income of 1107 and not to tax the income of 1108 on the basis of the income of 1107. At the time when the Bill was before the Select Committee, the only objection that was raised against this amendment proposed before it was that there was an undertaking to pass the Bill as it is in the Budget Session, when the proposal to introduce this Bill was put before this House. But I do not think any Member understood at that time that the income of 1107 will be taxed. Hon'ble Members only understood that the income of 1108 will be taxed. The Bill as it stands will make the income of 1107 taxable. Therefore I move this amendment.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. K. G. Nayar.—Sir, in seconding this amendment which is of the utmost importance for the purpose of the consideration of this Bill, I wish to say at the outset that the position of the non-official Members on this side of the House may not be misunderstood by the Government. I am sure we are open to some sort of criticism when we rise up to-day and say that the income of 1107 may not be taxed, much more so, in consideration of this one fact, that we were unanimous in the introduction of this Bill which perhaps the Government thought was acceptable to all the Members of the House so as to have the income of 1107 also taxed. On that broad question I wish to say a few words so that the Government may consider why those Hon'ble Members on the non-official block who first voted for the Budget and recommended that such a Bill be introduced for the acceptance of this House should now come forward and say that 1107 may be excluded. Sir, you will see that in all enactments of such a nature which affect the financial capacity of the ordinary rate-payer or the tax-payer of the State, it is but just and proper that some consideration should be extended to the ordinary tax-payer just to prepare himself for a new taxation and see that he is ready for paying the tax and that a new taxation is not sprung upon him all on a sudden. Certainly, all the Hon'ble Members of this House and all the visitors who were present on the day the Bill was introduced during the Budget Session know full well that there were even representations from very many Taluks including some of the Hon'ble Members representing some of the Constituencies who certainly marked their protest against the introduction of the Bill as a whole. Then there were other considerations that were brought forward that the Bill may not be introduced so as to have retrospective effect. This is not a new thing which has sprung upon the Government for the first time from the non-official members of this House. It may seem rather at first quite curious, contradictory and paradoxical. The Government may say, "well, you Hon'ble Members allowed us to introduce the Bill and told us that the two lakhs of rupees may be added to the revenues for the year 1108. If 1107 income is not to be taxed how can the Government have two lakhs for 1108?" True, of course. By the expressions that I see from the Treasury Bench, I anticipate that that will be the most important point that will be pressed against us in this matter. But our answer there is, there are two aspects to be considered here. After all if 1107 income is not taxable and if Government is not able to realise the revenue of about 2 lakhs by taxation of 1107 earnings, is Government likely to loose such a considerable

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

amount of money as to embarrass them in the ordinary and orderly conduct of the Government? I may say here even though we are grumbling over the financial stringency, trade depression and other things our Government are not at all lagging behind when they do things in their own way. Very often it so happens that whatever we do here and however much we may talk on the Budget, some new Department is opened or some extra expenditure is incurred, so much so that even though we balance the Budget by approximate figures as probable revenue and disbursements we come across various items where unnecessary expenditure is incurred and poor rate payers' money is utilised for that purpose. I do not wish to quote any instances in this matter to show how new Departments are created, how new officers are being appointed and how new Travelling Allowances' are being sanctioned so much so that even a considerable sum of two lakhs of rupees you could certainly have saved if only the Government tried to see that much money was not spent lavishly in such counts. That is one position which the Hon'ble Members on the Treasury Bench should remember.

Another position is this. Of course, in such taxation, as in all fiscal enactments which necessarily affects the rate-payer, the Government must necessarily give the rate-payer a sufficient length of time so that he may know what it is and where he stands. Last time during the Budget Session we voted for the introduction of the Bill and we are now having it for consideration. If the House passes the same it gets the gracious assent of His Highness and it becomes law at once, and you will see that it takes effect ordinarily in every enactment on the date His Highness is pleased to give His assent. Although His Highness may be graciously pleased to give His Highness' assent on a day subsequent to this day, it can naturally be somewhere in December or January as we are now in November. Within the month of December or say before we meet during the next session of the Legislative Council His Highness will be pleased to give his royal sanction and then only it becomes law. When such assent is given in 1108 we want to have retrospective effect for this legislation for the year 1107 when they never framed such a legislation. And that one aspect I wish to emphasise upon the Government's consideration very very earnestly because we have after the introduction of this Bill come across various representations. I can certainly say so far as my constituency is concerned, although it is not hard hit by the introduction of this legislation, still it is within the memory of this House, how during the last Budget Session when this Bill was sought to be introduced very many representative non-official gentlemen happened to present petitions through

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the Deputy President for the consideration of this House *viz.*, to postpone the introduction of that measure. When such was the consideration and when you find that people actually express that they are not prepared to receive this measure of taxation with a retrospective effect and when naturally we see that legislation comes into force only on the day His Highness is pleased to accord His sanction, it is but proper and in the fitness of things that in this legislative measure we may not tax the poor rate-payer with a retrospective effect. This is another aspect which I wish the Government will seriously consider.

The third and the very important consideration is this. You will certainly see after going through the whole Bill there is, I am told and I also wanted to elicit some information regarding that, a fear of double taxation coming in, if this Bill is passed into law. To quote a practical example we will take it that there are many of our Cochinites who may be getting income and permanently residing in British India. Any income which these gentlemen get from the Cochin State is liable to be assessed there and for that very same income for which they pay assessment in British India, under the present Regulation they have to pay a tax here also. When I consulted the Hon'ble the Law Member regarding this particular aspect of the case the Law Member said, that was a matter of adjustment between the two Governments, and that when the two Governments mutually agree there is no fear of double taxation. Then certainly the subjects do not stand to suffer by having to pay for their income here which is taxable in another place also. That is a very serious point. It may be seen by a comparison of the provisions of this Bill that that point was never considered so far as these sections are concerned. But if ultimately that correspondance ends unfavourably to the Cochin Government, is it not a matter for serious consideration to take that aspect of the case also *viz*., the case of the Cochinite having had to pay double taxation for the income which he derives. That is also a serious matter. Prima facie it may seem to be anomalous that we should say that 1108 should be changed into 1109 and the consequences and seriousness of the same are such that rate-payers' interests would be better safeguarded and the Government will not stand to loose the alarming big figure of two lakhs of rupees. So I say Government will be well advised by considering the difficulties of the rate-payers and the seriousness of the issues involved in this matter and accept this amendment by changing 1108 into 1109, without seriously thinking that this is a thing for which we have pledged ourselves by saying that it ought to be 1108.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. P. Krishna Menon.—Sir, a similar amendment stands in my name also. So I support this amendment. Now, one point, by way of information, I should like to elicit. If this amendment is carried with the result that 1108 is changed into 1109 will not the Government be realising the tax of the income of the people for 1108?

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon.—In 1109, income of 1108 will be taxed.

Mr. P. Krishna Menon.—Therefore, by carrying the amendment to avoid the charge of legislating for a period which was not in contemplation, the only disadvantage the Government will suffer is the postponement of the realisation of the amount by one year. The point that I want to emphasise again is this. It is for the first time in 1108 that the Government relied upon the income from this particular source. Even if the amendment is carried the Government is not deprived of the income; for the realisation alone is postponed and the income of 1108 is realised when it is postponed in 1109. Therefore by carrying out the amendment, by that we do not mean to say you will not be able to tax the income of 1108 also. That will be in the next year. But on the other hand, the legislation or rather the income contemplated being strictly for the year 1108, I believe there is no moral justification for the Government to go back and say "we want a tax on the income of 1107 also". In that line I beg to support the amendment.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—May I ask the Government whether they would be in a very serious financial embarrassment if the income for 1107 is not realised?

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon.—Sir, I oppose the amendment. I think it will be better if I make certain ideas about tax collection clear so that you may follow the trend of discussions. I agree with the mover of the amendment that what is taxed is the income of the year 1107. I may also mention here, just for the information of the Hon'ble Members of this House, that originally even in British India, the taxation, as it began, took into account the income of the year in which the Bill came into law as the basis of taxation. Suppose Income-Tax Bill was brought in 1108. What was taken as the basis of taxable income was that of the year 1108 itself. That was how the taxation proceeded in British India. The income for that year was taken as the basis. It was found to be extremely unworkable in practice. It required readjustments and a number of other obligations, so that every Government that had to deal with the matter found that the thing was unworkable. We have thus to take this *i. e.* the previous year's income as the accepted

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

standard of taxation. The income raised in the previous year will be taken as the basis of taxation for the next year. On that point all modern Income-tax Acts are agreed. Even in England it was in the other way first, but I think it was changed by the Finance Act. That point is now accepted by all the lawyers there. The income of the previous year should be taken as the basis of taxation. One objection raised is that the Act is retrospective. Even if the amendment is accepted, the income that is taxed in 1109 will be that of 1108. So that the thing is retrospective even if it comes into force in 1109. The argument of retrospective effect, therefore, cannot be of any force.

I do not think there is any question of principle involved here. What is wanted is an immunity for one year on the ground that they had no notice. The only effective argument is that they had no opportunity to make themselves familiar with the provisions of the Bill. That is an understandable argument.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—What is the meaning of retrospective effect with reference to this Act?

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon.—If the Act comes into force in 1109, the income of 1108 is still the taxable income.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—You are assessing the tax upon certain items before you pass that into law. You are taxing the income of 1107, when you are only passing the Act in 1108.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon.—That is what is done in every civilised country where income-tax is now imposed. Whether in British India or Travancore or Mysore, what is done is to tax the previous year's income, so that it seems to me that there is no question of principle involved here except the argument of want of notice. As to that we have got two answers. In the first place, this argument can apply only to procedural changes. If the argument of delay is accepted it will lead to this result, that no statute can come into law unless one or two years clear notice is given. Even if there is something in that argument, I submit that the argument as to delay is effectively countered by the fact that the interest has long been overdue. Hon'ble Members were clamouring for it and protesting that legislation has been delayed. And if we refer to previous Proceedings, the Members who advocated the Income-tax spoke of the general disinclinations of the people to pay as the only obstacle to immediate legislation. After all, Hon'ble Members will see that even with respect to the argument of hardship this tax falls not upon the poor or upon the indigent, but upon the classes that can afford to pay and decline to pay anything towards the cost of administration. It is on that class that the income-tax falls. I submit therefore there is no reason why there should be any

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

postponement, except a general desire to get immunity for one year.

I may also refer in this connection to the proceedings of the Budget Session. The then Diwan Peishkar, Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar moved for an expenditure of Rs. 6,000 for Income-tax Charges. The Member for Trichur had tabled a cut motion in that connection, to reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for Income-tax by Re. 1. (The undesirability of collecting tax on incomes in 1108 M. E. on account of the general economic depression in the State.)

I dare say it cannot be contended in the face of that that Members were not aware of the taxation in 1108. The Diwan Peishkar at the outset explained the Government position with regard to the three cut motions. The Member was evidently satisfied and said "I do not move the motion standing in my name."

The argument of the Hon'ble Member for Nemmara that we are creating many other departments and incurring extra expenditure is really in favour of the introduction of the tax in 1108. Necessities have to be provided. Therefore I submit I have to oppose the motion.

Mr. P. Krishna Menon.—May I invite the Hon'ble the Law Member's attention to clause 1, sub-clause (1). No amendments have been proposed to that. If the change is effected will it be still retrospective?

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon.—Yes.

Mr. P. Krishna Menon.—Will it be? But the amendment is proposed to section 3.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon.—There is a statute, a dead statute, in 1107. It becomes a living statute in 1108.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—I desire to support this motion. I may at the outset say that we have treated this as a party motion. There is a similar motion in my name which need not be independently moved. The report presented by the Select Committee, is attempting to steal a march over us, and, we shall not allow this to be done. Let us compare the Bill published on the 9th July 1932 with the redrafted Bill. In the original Bill, it is stated "This Regulation may be called the Cochin Income-Tax Regulation.....of..... It extends to the whole of Cochin State, and shall come into force....." These dots were not filled up. Now what is the effect of that, read along with the present draft, in which it is stated "This Regulation may be called the Income-Tax Regulation of *1108*; It extends to the whole of the Cochin State and it shall come into force *at once*. So that the amended Bill makes a world of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

difference. It was not proposed in the original Bill that this would be a Regulation of 1108 and it should come into force at once. The Hon'ble the Law Member was not right in saying that these things were all there when the Bill was introduced here and discussions proceeded upon that basis. In my speech, objecting the introduction of the Income-tax Bill, I clearly pointed out that it is unfair to assess the income of 1107 and collect the tax in 1108 M. E. That objection still holds good. If in the original Bill it was stated that this Regulation was to be made law in 1108, and that it would come into force at once, everybody would have understood that the Government wanted to collect the income-tax in 1108 on the basis of the supposed earnings of 1107. Absolutely nothing of the kind is seen in the draft. The difference is of a vital and far-reaching character. What are you collecting now? I do not agree with the Law Member in saying that the Regulation would have retrospective effect, even though we collect the amount in 1109. It would not be so. In 1108 we pass the Regulation which is to take effect in 1109. It is one thing to say that the Regulation has retrospective effect and quite another thing to say that the basis for calculation is upon the supposed earnings of the previous year; so that I venture to submit, echoing the sentiments of the rate-payers in the several constituencies that this Bill is clearly stealing a march upon the Council. The Select Committee had no business to recast the Bill, so as to cause unforeseen hardship upon people who are liable to be taxed on incomes. They had no business to say that this Regulation should come into force in 1108. It was for the Council to fix the date. Now on this ground I object to the collection of this amount in 1108 itself. When half the year has rolled on, there is no meaning in saying that Government will collect the tax upon the supposed income of 1107. You must again make out a necessity for imposing any additional burden on the people. I have not yet been impressed, by the speeches from the Government side that you cannot carry on the administration of 1108 without this income derived under the proposed tax. You may have to meet expenses in connection with the Harbour and the Railway. The Income-tax is not levied for meeting the expenses of the Harbour or of the Railway. We have been always insisting on the floor of this House that these expenses ought to be met by debenture loans. That is the vital objection to the Bill and that is the vital objection in bringing it into force in the year 1108. The Members of the Council advocated the introduction of the Income-tax. But that is no excuse to say that the Bill must come into force at once. Let me put a very

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

extreme case. Suppose you bring this Bill forward in Mithunam, and say that you want this money to carry on the administration of this year. Would you then expect us to agree that you may by legislation be permitted to collect the income-tax for the whole of this year unless unexpected contingencies occurred? I say it is most unfair and most inequitable. It is wrong to say that income-tax affects only those who are in a position to pay. It is not so. You say agricultural income is exempted. If the money in the possession of an assessee be invested on Agriculture, it is not liable to be taxed. If you receive some income from land and invest it on something else, it is liable to be taxed. The number of persons in Cochin liable to be assessed, who do not pay land tax, is quite small. This is not an emergent measure. The people are entitled to previous notice. You ought to give us previous notice of the Income-tax Bill and then you may bring into force the law as passed by the House and collect the amount next year, the basis being the income of this year. That has been the accepted principle everywhere, and that is the only fair principle to go by.

The Law Member pointed out that I put forward economic depression as the reason for my amendment to the previous Bill. That was an objection to the main Bill itself. I did not move the amendment because my opposition to the main Bill fell through. It was not then worthwhile moving the amendment. Economic depression has to be taken into account even now, because it is too well known that the incomes of 1108 for all classes of people would be less than their incomes in the previous year. With increasing depression the income of the people is being reduced year by year. So if people are going to be taxed on the basis of the income of 1107, the basis would be wrong. I presented this aspect in opposing the main Bill.

My submission, therefore, is that the amended Bill submitted by the Select Committee on the basis of the Mysore Act is materially different from the original draft. The alterations affect the Bill vitally, and upon a very important matter, to the prejudice of the tax-payer. Upon these grounds, I strongly support the motion, moved by the Hon'ble Member for Ernakulam

Mr. M. Krishna Menon.—I too support this amendment. In opposing the amendment the Hon'ble Member for Law admitted that in all civilised countries where this income-tax was introduced they began by collecting the tax on the current year's income and subsequently, when they found difficulty in the matter of collection, they followed this procedure of collecting the tax on the previous year's income. But I am sure that

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

none of those civilised countries ever collected the tax on the income of the year previous to the one in which the Bill was introduced. So hereafter it would be safer for us to follow the present method of collecting the tax on the income of 1108 in 1109 so that the difficulties may be avoided. If they began as the Government wants now here to do by collecting tax on the previous year's income then there would have been no difficulty. It is only after they found out this difficulty that they changed the method of collection so that no refund is necessary. None of these countries ever collected the tax on the previous year's income in which the Bill was introduced. So I support the amendment.

Mr. George Chakyamuri.—I should like to support this amendmet. The Hon'ble the Law Member made an observation that the amendment is a ruse to get immunity for one year. I should take strong exception to this statement, regard being had to the fact of the willingness with which this House co-operated with the Government for the introduction of this Bill. If we were not willing to pay money we were at perfect liberty to throw out the Bill in toto.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon.—Did I say ruse?

Mr. George Chakyamuri.—It amounted to that.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon.—No. No.

Mr. George Chakyamuri.—I would put it just the other way. I should regard it as a ruse on the part of the Government servants to get the salary cut lifted (*Laughter*) by bringing into force as early as possible the Income-tax Bill, so that they can say 'we have made 2½ lakhs; kindly remove the salary cut'. So it is not fair, I say once again as long as it was quite open to us to throw out the Bill. If they were not willing to pay money the representatives of the people here would have raised a hue and cry when the Bill was being considered. I submit the amendment was not moved in that spirit and it should not be viewed in that light. It is only based on a principle. People should not be taxed for an amount which they have already spent away.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അച്യുതൻ.—ഈ നിയമ കേന്ദ്രങ്ങളും നിയമ വ്യവഹാരങ്ങളും പറയുന്നതിനെതിരായി പറവാൻ എനിക്കു ഒന്നും തന്നെ ഇല്ല. കാമൺ സെൻസ് വച്ചു ഒരു സംഗതി പറയാം. സർവ്വമെണ്ടു നടപടികളിലുള്ള വിഷമതകൾ തീർക്കുവാൻ വേണ്ടി ജനങ്ങളിൽനിന്നു പണം പിരിച്ചുകളയാമെന്നു വയ്ക്കുന്നതു് അനന്യായമായിരിക്കും.

Mr.P.Raman Menon.—Sir, I also rise to support the amendment. I had also tabled an amendment with regard to

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the very same section. I was induced to do so on account of the great economic depression that the country is passing through, to-day. The Bill, as it is, is retrospective in its effect; there is no doubt about that. Whatever you may say, we have to pay the tax for 1107 also. You may put it in any different language. The effect is the same. My suggestion was to enforce the Bill from 1110 M. E. We will be then taxed only for the income of 1109. The Bill has not become law as yet. It is to become law only hereafter. Even if you accept this amendment, it will have a retrospective effect partially; because you are taxing the whole of 1108, when half of it has already passed. It was to avoid all retrospective effect, that I wanted the Bill to come into force only in 1110 M. E. Every Bill which throws a burden on the people ought not to have any retrospective effect. They must have clear notice. They earn money and spend money; it is unfair to ask them to account for the money they received years ago. It is after taking into consideration all these things that I tabled the amendment. When I afterwards discussed my amendment with my colleagues, I found that the majority of the Members were in favour of enforcing it in 1109 itself, and therefore I did not move it. I wholeheartedly support this amendment.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—Sir, my question has not been answered. I would ask the Government what their financial condition would be if this tax is not collected in 1108?

Mr. P. V. Subramania Ayyar.—The Member will find from the budget that we have been just able to tide over our budget and our difficulties in regard to the expenditure of 1108 by providing for income-tax to the extent of 2 lakhs.

Mr. A. Sankara Menon.—That leaves a surplus of about a lakh and odd at the end of the year. It is only Rs. 30,000 that is wanting.

Mr. P. V. Subramania Ayyar.—That may go reduced and there is no guarantee that the aggregate budget will end in deficit or surplas. As the other Member himself has said we have introduced salary cut, T. A. cut and cut in the matter of development departments. So that if this grant already made is withdrawn it is very likely that Government will be landed in financial difficulties. That is all I can say.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.—To what extent exactly?

Mr. P. V. Subramania Ayyar.—To the extent adumbrated in the budget.

Mr. U. Kandar Menon.—I have to say a few words. I don't think that the Hon'ble Members were quite right in saying that section 3 as it stands gives restrospective effect. As

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the Bill becomes law in 1108, it cannot be said that it has retrospective effect if the tax is imposed from 1108. If for this purpose, the income for 1108 is to be taken as the basis, the income so fixed can only be approximate as the exact amount of income can be ascertained only at the end of the year. This will necessitate a refund of the tax already realised in certain cases and the levy of additional tax in other cases. It is only to avoid such difficulties that the income of 1107 is taken as the basis in fixing the tax for 1108.

Mr. A. Sankara Menon.—What about the instances that I mentioned?

Mr. U. Kandar Menon.—That is quite different. I can understand my learned friend's argument that in such cases the person or the Company concerned should not be taxed. The objection raised by the Hon'ble Member for Ernakulam will exist even if the proposed amendment is accepted. Of course, I can understand my learned friend's objection when he says that in cases where the Company has ceased to exist in 1108, it may be hard to tax that Company. In the same way if a person has not earned any assessable income in 1108, he should not be taxed. But to say that the section as it stands has retrospective effect, is not correct. It is only to avoid over-charge and refunds that the framers of Bill thought it necessary to take into account the income of the previous year for the purpose of determining the amount of tax payable in the next year. The only argument that can be raised is that people had not sufficient notice and so the tax ought not to be collected in 1108. That argument is perfectly intelligible. But in that connection, the Hon'ble Members will also be pleased to remember that the House has passed the budget and that it is on the basis of the income to be derived from income-tax also that the Government have prepared their estimate of expenditure in the budget. It is within the knowledge of the Hon'ble Members that several unfoerseen expenditure might arise in the course of the year and many Hon'ble Members were submitting to this House that the surplus budgets may often turn out to be deficit budgets when the year is closed. And now when the Hon'ble Members do not want to introduce the tax in the year 1108, they say that there will not be any large deficit on account of the non-imposition of the tax in 1108. This is my respectful submission.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—They do not propose to pay anything for the year 1108, as I understood it.

Mr. U. Kandar Menon.—I can very well understand that. But there is no use of raising the argument that we are taxing the income of 1107.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. K. G. Nayar—Do you want a legislation to levy a tax on the income that is to accrue due year after year or has already accrued due?

Mr. U. Kandar Menon.—Ordinarily the yearly tax is levied upon the basis of the income of the same year. That was the provision in all Income-tax Regulations. This necessitated refunds and the levy of additional tax as already submitted. To avoid that difficulty, the provisions were altered and the income of the previous year was taken as the basis of taxation for the next year.

Mr. M. A. Chakko.—I wish to speak a few words having heard what the Government had to say and what the mover of the amendment had to say in support of the amendment. I don't think I can support the amendment having heard both sides of the question. I therefore wish to put forth my views before the House. Taxation I should say is a necessary evil when looked at from certain angles of vision. The Government business has to be carried on by revenue which is called finance. The point is that the revenue has to come by taxation of the subjects of the State in whatever way it is possible, It has been pointed out by the Hon'ble the Law Member that this House had urged upon the Government that such a taxation was overdue and therefore it would not be in keeping with what has been said before on the floor of this House to now say that the income for 1107 should not be taxed. Be that as it may. My observation about that matter is that the administration of 1108 has to be carried on. There is a deficit or there is every probability of a deficit facing the Government; and the Hon'ble Finance Member was pointing out that there would be a deficit. Unless we are very sanguine upon our expectations, the exact amount that would be deficit has to be seen yet only. If the income-tax by which we expect 2 lakhs of rupees does not come in there would be a deficit of Rs. 50,000 or less than a lakh. That is what we can hope for from the figures that have been placed before us in the Budget.

Now come to the main question again; the burden of taxation has to be borne by the subjects of the State. The cry on the floor of this House repeated over and over again is that certain section of His Highness' subjects are taxed while others go free, or don't get the burden of taxation as they ought to get it; while they are able to bear the burden they are not given sufficient weight to bear. Here, the Hon'ble Member for Palli-viruthi was just referring to the fact that certain burden is laid upon the official members by a sort of salary cut and they are trying to get over the difficulty of bearing that burden by inviting

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the income-tax to come earlier. I think they are just in having that expectation or hope because they are already paying the tax while others are avoiding the tax for one year. The salary cut has come on them, I think, from the beginning of 1108. The Members on this side of the House say, 'Let the burden come on us next year. In the meantime, let the official members bear the burden'. Again there is a set of people who are called the agriculturists. They are also groaning under the weight of the burden of taxation, while certain people, who don't pay any tax at all on incomes which are non-agricultural, say they will pay later on, when good times come. Looking at these circumstances and aspects of the case, I cannot make up my mind to support this amendment and I don't think the immunity which we, the non-agricultural people ask for is legitimate or reasonable. For these reasons I should oppose the motion.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—Sir, the Leader of the Progressive Party has said that the amendment before the House is a party motion. With his permission, however, I should like to oppose the amendment. It is only natural that there should be a general unwillingness to pay any kind of tax; and this, I am afraid, has weighed with many of the Hon'ble Members who have supported the motion. I say this with due regard to what my friend the Hon'ble Member for Palliviruthi has said. The position, as the Hon'ble Member for Nemmara has said, is this: This Council on the occasion of the discussion of the budget, passed an item of 2 lakhs of rupees on the receipt side. Now, any one who has got some idea of income-tax must have known that this item was based on the income of the previous year. Many of the Hon'ble Members, who are vakils, must have known that income-tax in British India is collected on the income of the previous year. If then they budgetted for 2 lakhs for 1108, naturally it follows that they anticipated, or at least they must have known, that this 2 lakhs could be realised only by charging on the income of the previous year.

Mr. George Chakyamuri.—May I know whether this House passed the receipt side also? I don't think that this House passed the receipt side. I should point out, the Member is mistaken. We do not pass the receipt side of the budget. We discuss and pass the disbursement side only.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—When we pass a budget having a receipt side and a disbursement side and when we pass the disbursement side with reference to the receipt side, it is understood that we pass the receipt side also. There is no meaning in saying that we passed the disbursement side without reference to the receipt side. Therefore, this is the position; the Legis-

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ative Council, a responsible body, had committed itself to a position of granting the Government 2 lakhs under income-tax for 1108; and now the same body comes up and says that it should like to go back upon its vote and get an immunity of 2 lakhs.

There is of course the question whether it is not a tax with retrospective effect. Something like a retrospective effect is inevitable in the case of any Income-tax Bill; it is inherent in its very nature. In British India the original procedure was to collect income-tax only on the basis of the current year's income. But later on they too began to calculate it on the previous year's income. Now, in that transitional year, where they began to collect the current year's tax on the basis of the previous year's income, they too, must have been faced with this objection of giving retrospective effect to their new method of assessment. Therefore, it is only a case of juggling with words to say that because the Bill has got a retrospective effect therefore it could not be accepted. The retrospective effect was so very plain when the budget was passed. Everybody understood that 2 lakhs was to be realised in 1108 under income-tax. How was this 2 lakhs going to be realised unless a tax was levied on the basis of the income of 1107? What I say is this: whatever might have been the original methods in British India, at least for the last 10 years the practice there must have been to collect the income-tax on the basis of the previous year's income. Hon'ble Members, who are vakils must have known that practice. They cannot therefore, now come and say that they were under a misapprehension when they passed the budget; that there was no notice; and that therefore they have been taken unawares.

On this occasion I would request the Hon'ble Members of this House to look not only to the industrial and professional classes but also to the agriculturists. Every time we pressed the question of income-tax in this House one of our arguments was the relief it would bring to the suffering agriculturists. More money is required in Cochin to bring relief to the agriculturists and if now we refuse to place more money at the disposal of the Government, then it means that we have very little sympathy for the agriculturists who have been groaning under the burden of taxation all these years. If this tax is not levied this year, it means that money, which could be made available for many of the amenities of social life for the agriculturists, would not be forthcoming. On the contrary, if it is collected this year itself, a good deal of that money can be spent on providing various necessities to the agriculturists of the country.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Again, there was the Select Committee appointed by this House to scrutinise the Bill and that Committee has by a majority decided, and rightly too, to collect the tax on the income of 1107. Even the Hon'ble Members who wrote a dissenting note on this question—Messrs. A. Sankara Menon, E. Ikkanda Warriar and Popatlal—have not strongly opposed the majority proposal. For we find them proposing an alternative of collecting only. Now this Council is going back upon the original position taken up by itself, as also by the Select Committee.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—Are we not entitled to do that?

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—I only say that this Council is going back upon the original position taken up by itself and also upon the position taken up by the Select Committee. I do not say that this Council has no right to go back upon the position taken up by the Select Committee. But I say that there is something of irresponsibility when the Council goes back upon the position which it had originally taken up.

Now let us look at the hardship that would be caused if the tax is collected this year itself. Just to make a case out of a few rare instances would be bad statesmanship. We can very well understand there may be a few cases of hardship and for these cases perhaps the Government might very well have proposed some transitory measure by which the people who had income in 1107 and who are bankrupt in 1108 might easily be exempted. That would do away with the difficulties to the people. At the same time that will not be creating financial embarrassments to the Government.

It must also be remembered that this tax will, as has been already pointed out, fall not on the poorer classes but on the richer classes, who could afford to pay. May be if you go on hair-splitting, you can conjure up a few cases of hardship. But practically speaking, will it entail serious hardship on the people of Cochin if income-tax is collected on the basis of 1107? I think it won't. One Hon'ble Member was pleased to say that depression is growing. On the contrary, I should say that conditions are much better in 1108 than in 1107, so far as this State is concerned. Look at the price of copra; it has improved in 1108. Look at the price of paddy; I have definite information that the price of paddy too has improved.

Dr. A. G. Menon.—Not in our Taluks.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—You may contradict. But from personal experience in my own constituency I can say that paddy which stood at 6 annas, has gone up to 8 annas and more. Therefore, though you may not concede the position that condi-

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

tions are better in 1108 than in 1107, I can at least say that conditions in 1108 are not worse than they were in 1107.

Therefore, to throw up our original position for a few imaginable cases of hardship would be rather out of keeping with the dignity of this House. We must stick up to that position unless something very serious has happened since then; and I do not think that anything, justifying a change of position, has happened in the last few months.

Briefly then, the position is this: on the one side there is the question of sacrificing, of throwing overboard the responsibility and dignity of this House; on the other side there are a few cases of hardship for which the Government can very well provide. Between the two which will you choose? Even this morning we were speaking of the dignity of this House, its sense of responsibility, its capacity to undertake responsible Government—we should not blow hot and cold in the same breath. No, this House has a financial responsibility to keep up, a dignity to maintain. Now by this amendment we are throwing away all these, simply on account of a few imaginary cases of hardship. These cases are more problematic than real; and even if they are real, there is no difficulty for the Government to provide for such cases. I therefore strongly oppose the motion.

Mr. P. S. Kesavan Nambudiri.—I am very sorry that I could not see eye to eye with the Hon'ble Member for Adoor. Taking for granted that at the time of voting for the budget last time we were mistaken in calculating the income from Income-tax for 1108, are you going to commit further blunders to justify one past error? Just as the Government, every individual also would have estimated his budget at the beginning of the year. For example, at the beginning of 1107 every one would have estimated his family budget for that year and by the end of that year we could expect that he would have spent the whole of that income and there would be nothing left for 1108. Then are you now calling upon him to pay from his income in 1107? Certainly he will be driven to borrow; he will become a bankrupt. Therefore it will be quite unjust on the part of the Government to assess on the income of 1107. To give retrospective effect to this statute would be a very great hardship on the part of the people. Therefore though we might have committed a mistake, to justify that we should not commit further blunders. Therefore I support this motion.

Mr. K. G. Nayar.—On a point of information. Is this amount of 2 lakhs which the Government propose to get in 1108 going to be utilised for the benefit of the agricultural community in the State?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—No receipt is car-marked for a particular expenditure.

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. കെ. നായർ.—ഇതുവരെ ഇവിടെ ഉണ്ടായ വാദം കേട്ടപ്പോൾ രണ്ടുവാക്ക് പറയാമെന്നു തോന്നിയതുകൊണ്ട് ഈ വിഷയത്തെപ്പറ്റി എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം പറയാം. നിയമസംബന്ധമായി യാതൊന്നും വാദിക്കുവാനുണ്ടെന്നു തോന്നുന്നില്ല. ഫ ഫ ൦ ൈ-ലെ ആദായം അടിസ്ഥാനമാക്കി ആദായനികുതി ഫ ഫ ൦ വ-ൽ പിരിച്ചാലും, ഫ ഫ ൦ വ-ലെ ആദായം അടിസ്ഥാനമാക്കി ഫ ഫ ൦ ന്-ൽ പിരിച്ചാലും നായം ഒന്നുതന്നെയാണ്. ഇതിൽ വാദവിഷയമുണ്ടെന്നു തോന്നുന്നില്ല. ഒട്ടാകെ ഒന്നുമാത്രമേ ഇതിൽനിന്നു മനസ്സിലാകുന്നുള്ളു. ആദായനികുതി ഫ ഫ൦വ-ൽ പിരിക്കുന്നത് കഷ്ടമാണെന്നും ഫ ഫ ൦ ന്-ലേക്ക് ആക്കിയാൽ കൊള്ളാമെന്നും മാത്രമാണ് ഇതിന്റെ സാരം. ഈ നായം അടിസ്ഥാനമാക്കി ഞാൻ ഇതിനോടനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു. ഒരു ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർ നെല്ലിനും മറ്റും ഇപ്പോഴും വില കൂടിയിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നു പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. അദ്ദേഹം അങ്ങാടിയിൽനിന്ന് അരിവില്ലയ്ക്കു വാങ്ങി ഉപയോഗിക്കുന്ന ആളായിരിക്കാം. അരിക്കു വിലകൂടുള്ളതുകൊണ്ട് നാട്ടുമുഴുവനും സുഭിക്ഷമാണെന്നാണ് അദ്ദേഹം ധരിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നത്. നെല്ലിനു വില കൂടുതലല്ല—കുറവാണ്—ഞാൻ നെല്ലുവിറ്റു നികുതി കൊടുക്കുന്നവരുടെ കൂട്ടത്തിൽപെട്ടവനാണ്. നെല്ലിന്റെ വിലയെപ്പറ്റി എനിക്കു നല്ലവണ്ണം പരിചയമുണ്ട്. നികുതി കൊടുക്കുവാൻ കൂടി ജനങ്ങൾ കഷ്ടപ്പെടുന്നു. സാധനങ്ങളുടെ വില കുറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് ജനങ്ങൾ പലപ്രകാരത്തിലും കഷ്ടപ്പെടുന്നുണ്ട്. അങ്ങനെയുള്ള കാലമായതുകൊണ്ട് ആദായനികുതി പിരിക്കുന്നതു ഫ ഫ ൦ ന്-ലേക്കാക്കിയാൽ കൊള്ളാം. എന്നാൽ ഈ ഒരു കൊല്ലത്തെ കഷ്ടപ്പാടുകൂടാതെ കഴിഞ്ഞല്ലൊ എന്നുമാത്രം. ഈ ഒരു നായംമാത്രമേ ഇതിനോടനുകൂലിക്കുവാൻ ഞാൻ കാണുന്നുള്ളു.

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—I beg to submit to this House that the first and foremost duty of the House should be to balance the budget, to see that the budget is balanced. No Government can carry on its day to day administration with a budget large on the deficit side; and why should this House exist, why should we all exist here unless it be to carry on at least the day to day administration? And how can we carry on the day to day administration with a deficit budget?

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Of Rs. 30,000?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—Whatever it be, this is a Government progressing and expenses for public utility might be increasing. Therefore it is never safe for us to take intentionally any step the result of which will be an

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

unbalanced budget. The savings that we have is only a lakh and eighty thousand rupees. The Hon'ble Members themselves know with what considerable difficulty that such a small saving was shown in the budget. I have explained during the budget session more than half a dozen times why the Government were forced to have the salary cut on small paid officials on Rs. 60—80. Therefore the whole House knows with what considerable difficulty, with what great sacrifice—see even the Panchayat budget had to be cut—the Medical budget, the Sanitation, all these public utility budgets had to be cut down could a small savings of a lakh and odd rupees in the total estimated revenue of 80 and odd lakhs be had. The House knows with what considerable difficulty and what great sacrifice we have been able to achieve that result. By one stroke of the amendment you are going to upset the whole budget and we will be down by another Rs. 30,000. I would beg to submit that this is not correct on principle. That will be a very objectionable step.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—On a point of information. If the amount realised from the Burmah shell be got credited will it be a surplus budget?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—There will be no end to such stray questions either on the receipt side or on the expenditure side. We have got a set of receipts and expenses that shows a small saving of a lakh and eighty thousand rupees. By this amendment we will be losing 2 lakhs of rupees. So there will be a deficit of 30,000. This is all that we have to remember.

Then another point is the Select Committee report framed by a Committee on which this House was amply represented, did not raise any objection in its majority report to taking in the 1107 revenues. Don't we hear several other Governments emergency Financial Bills being introduced? What notice is given of such Bills? When are they introduced? Are they not introduced 8 months after the financial year, just to balance the budget? The House would not be misguided by the fact that the balancing of the budget is a mere routine matter. It is the most fundamental act of modern administration and if that fundamental principle is going to be regarded as a mere routine work then I submit I have nothing to say. It should not be regarded in that light at all. That is the one principle on which the whole world is to-day marching and carries on its day to day work. That is the reason why all the modern Governments when they are pressing with deficit budgets towards the close of the year bring in emergency Financial Bills. No

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

objection is ever raised on the ground that motive has not been given. Such reasons will stand provided we have got a good ample surplus. We are bringing in a Bill only for some more additional revenue. That is the situation. Here is a question of life and death struggle. The House should do everything to present a deficit budget.

Again another point, Sir. We could easily have avoided all these objections by taxing the 1108 income in 1108 itself. Then this objection would not have come at all. We would have got the money. But it would have been wrong on a scientific principle. The Science of income-tax declares that it is always more correct to tax the income of the previous year. On that basis we proceeded simply because we never wanted to be unscientific in our proceedings. The income-tax has its own fundamental principles. It is not simply a method of collecting money somewhere or somehow. It has got its own acknowledged principles to act upon. Therefore purposely we made this change and had the 1107 revenue ear-marked for taxation. Therefore on that ground also I say that this objection cannot stand any very severe strain.

Further, as the Hon'ble Member for Adoor said, who will be affected by this cut? The Government will of course be forced to balance the budget. There is no doubt about that. What will be the fate of the public utility Departments? Their hopes will have to suffer—D. P. W., Medical, Sanitation and the Panchayats, all these Heads will have to suffer and therefore again I doubt whether this is a step which this House should countenance. For all these reasons I beg to submit that this amendment, as it is, should not be pressed home.

Mr. A. Sankara Menon.—I do not want a single minute. The matter may be put to votes.

President.—The Finance Member wants to speak.

Mr. A. Sankara Menon.—I object to that because the official benches had its reply and it was after that, that I was asked to reply. No Member can be allowed to speak now. I submit that the question should be put to votes. It will be a bad precedent if any other Member is allowed to speak.

Amendment put and carried.

Mr. K. G. Nayar.—Poll, Sir.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

The House divided—Ayes 21 and Noes 13.

	Ays.		*Noes.*
1	Mr. A. Eachara Menon	1	Mr. K. Achyuta Menon
2	Dr. A. G. Menon	2	,, M. A. Chakko
3	Mr. K. G. Nayar	3	,, M. P. Cherian
4	,, George Chakyamuri	4	,, U. Kandar Menon
5	,, E. Ikkanda Warrier	5	,, C. J. Mathew
6	,, P. S. Kesavan Nambudiri	6	,, M. D. Narayana Ayyar
7	,, S. S. Koder	7	,, T. Narayana Menon
8	,, M. Krishna Menon	8	,, P. Neelakanta Menon
9	,, P. Krishna Menon	9	,, Joseph Pettah
10	,, T. K. Nayar	10	Rama Varmha Tampuran
11	,, P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan	11	Dr. D. Raghavendra Rao
12	,, Paul Mampilli	12	Mr. P. V. Raphael
13	,, K. T. Mathew	13	,, P. V. Subramania Ayyar
14	,, T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar		
15	,, P. Raman Menon		
16	M. K. Raman		
17	Dr. A. R. Menon		
18	Mr. A. Sankara Menon		
19	,, A. Sankara Poduval		
20	Mrs. Swaris		
21	Mr. K. P. Vallon		

The House rose for the day at 5 p. m.

C. J. MATHEW,
Secretary to the Council.

Minutes of the Standing Finance Committee Meeting.

A meeting of the Standing Finance Committee was held on Wednesday, the 16th of November 1932, at 1 p. m., in the Diwan's Room, Huzur Secretariat, with M. R. Ry. Rao Sahib T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar Avl., the Diwan-President, in the Chair.

Present :—

1 M. R. Ry. Rao Sahib T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar Avl., (Chairman.)
2 Rama Varmha Tampuran, M. A., B. Sc., Bat-at-Law
3 M. R. Ry. P. V. Subramania Ayyar Avl., B. A.
4 Dr. A. R. Menon
5 M. R. Ry. E. Ikkanda Warriar Avl., B. A., B. L.
6 ,, Joseph Pettah Avl., M. A.
7 ,, C. J. Mathew Avl., B. A., B. L. (Convener)

The following items of supplementary grants were considered at the meeting and passed:—

1 Rs. 6,645—under VII—Excise—Refunds
2 ,, 20,955—under X—Forests
3 ,, 1,000—under XI—Tramway
4 ,, 110—under XIV—iv—Legislative Council
5 ,, 287—under Land Revenue—Refunds—Cranganur
6 ,, 110—under 6—Excise—T A —Cranganur
7 ,, 150—under 16—Medical-Miscellaneous—Cranganur
8 ,, 1,149—under XVI—Law and Justice

The Committee rose at 1-30 p. m.

C. J. MATHEW,
Convener and Secretary to the Council.

APR 4 1933

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly